COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. XVI. No. 14.] LONDON, SATURDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1809. [Price 1s.

"The inhabitants of WARSAW (the capital of Poland) are making preparations for holding a grand "JUBILEE on the birth day of the Emperor Napoleon, the restorer of their liberties and their "constitution."——STATESMAN.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

PISTOLLING PRIVY-COUNSELLORS.——Since the publication of my last Number, there has appeared in one of the hireling prints, the Morning Post, of the 3rd instant, a statement of the original cause of the Duel, upon Putney Heath, between Lord Castlereagh and Mr. Canning. This statement is curious; for, though one cannot place implicit reliance upon it, one may easily see, that it contains some truth. In time, the whole will come out. It is the interest of the people to get a knowledge of all the facts connected with this matter; because, hence they will be able, upon some future occasion, to turn such knowledge to good account.——I beg the reader to pay attention to this exposure; and to stop, now-and-then, during the perusal, and reflect, for a moment, that these men were the king's two Principal Secretaries of State, and, occasionally, sat with his Majesty in council.——"In addition to the particulars which we stated "yesterday, in respect to the circumstances which led to the late extraordinary duel, we have to state, that towards "the close of the session, when Lord "Grenville Leveson Gower's writ was to "be moved for, on account of his coming "into office and the Cabinet, that Mr. "Canning called upon the Duke of Portland, not upon the Cabinet, as a condition of his remaining in the government, "to give him a decision upon the proposition (to which *as early as March last* "he had induced the Duke of Portland to "consent) *for removing Lord Castlereagh, "and appointing the Marquis Wellesley his "successor*; and the Duke of Portland having given Mr. Canning *a specific and "positive promise to this effect*, Mr. Canning pressed that it should be immediately acted upon, and Lord Castlereagh "acquainted with it. Lord Castlereagh, "however, *was not acquainted with it, and "Mr. Canning acquiesced in its being concealed from him.* Undoubtedly, Lord "Camden was acquainted with the transactions; but it is not true that his lordship ever undertook to make the disclosure to Lord Castlereagh, nor did he ever "make it. It is also true, that Mr. Canning was thoroughly apprized that it "was not made known to Lord Castlereagh. And it is farther true, that Lord "Castlereagh, being kept in profound ignorance of the decision for his removal "from office, *was permitted, though, in fact, "virtually no longer a Minister, and in this "state of delusion, to continue to conduct the "entire arrangement of the campaign, and to "engage in a new expedition of the most extensive, complicated, and important nature, "under the full persuasion, not that Mr. Canning had supplanted him in office, and possessed in his pocket a promise for his dismissal, but that he really enjoyed (as during the "period he, in outward shew, and daily concurrence, experienced) Mr. Canning's sincere, liberal, and bona fide support, as a co-operating and approving colleague.* It is "further known, that Mr. Canning, having "thus in his pocket Lord Castlereagh's "dismissal, and having arranged with the "Duke of Portland that it should be carried into execution at the termination of "the expedition, he did, on the 3rd September, the day that the account arrived "from Lord Chatham that he could not "proceed to Antwerp, write to the Duke "of Portland, demanding the execution of "the promise made to him. What were "all the difficulties which were started "from time to time against the immediate "execution of this promise it would be extremely difficult to detail; but there "cannot be a doubt but the question of "the Writership, which it has been attempted to connect with this transaction, "could have nothing to do with it, as Mr. "Canning never contended for Lord Castlereagh's removal from the government, "but from the particular office he held, "and into which he wished to introduce "Lord Wellesley. It appears that the demand of the fulfilment of the promise "led to the resignation of the Duke of "Portland, and subsequently of Mr. Can-

" ning. And it further appears, that, as " soon as the whole of this unparalleled " conduct was, at this late period, disclos- " ed to Lord Castlereagh, he immediately " placed his resignation in his Majesty's " hands.—On the truth of the above facts " the public may rely; and they can no " longer be at a loss for the real causes and " grounds of the demand made by Lord " Castlereagh for satisfaction from Mr. " Canning."——Now, reader, you will please to observe, that this is the account, which the hirelings themselves give of the matter; and the interesting fact, if it be true, is, that, after the Prime Minister had agreed to put Lord Castlereagh out of his office, that same man, so marked down for being turned out, was permitted to plan, and to put in execution, the Walcheren Expedition, which, in point of magnitude of force and of risk. surpassed all the other undertakings of the administration; this expedition, employing a hundred thousand soldiers and sailors, and costing the nation so many millions of money, was left to the sole discretion of a man against whom one of his colleagues had obtained a promise of ouster. Yet, to the public, these men appeared to be not only upon a friendly, but upon a very cordial footing; they not only exchanged the term " friend," as often as they had to speak of one another in the House of Commons, but, to all appearance, were very warmly attached to each other.——If the story here told by the hireling be true, there can be little doubt as to which party the greatest share of dishonour belongs. Lord Castlereagh *might* be sincere in his professions of friendship for the other, and *might* suppose, that he was acting with a " co-operating and approving colleague." I say, this *might* be the case, though I am far from believing that it was; but, if the hireling's story be true, the other *could not be sincere* in his professions of friendship, and did certainly act a part such as it would be very difficult to censure in terms sufficiently strong.——Only think of acting with a man, of holding council with, of carrying a fair face, and using a smooth and flattering tongue towards, a man, for six months, during the whole of which time the party so acting, carried in his pocket a promise of that man's dismission from office, and which promise had been procured by the said party! I do not believe, that any thing like this is to be found in the history of any set of men above the rank of tide-waiters.——Need we wonder at the failure of expeditions? Need we wonder at any failure whatever? Need we wonder, that our enemy has become the master of the continent of Europe? Why, what is it that makes one nation rise and another nation fall? Simply this, that the former is under the guidance of *wisdom*, and the latter under the guidance of *folly*; and, after all the puns and antitheses of the Cannings and the Freres; after all their jests, cracked upon Buonaparté and his family, and upon the people of France; after all this, we have only to cast our eyes over the two nations; we have only to take a glance at their relative situation, to be able to judge as to which is under the guidance of wisdom, and which under the guidance of folly. ——This nation has always borne the character of being *thoughtful* and *brave*, and especially in all matters, and upon all occasions, when its *rights* and *liberties* were at stake; and, would any man, only thirty years ago, have believed it possible, that this nation, at a time like this, would have looked on in silence, while its affairs were in the hands of men, who, after many months of ill-will, sally out upon a heath and pistol each other?——At the very time when this is going on in our cabinet, amongst our guardians of the state, Napoleon is concerting, in human probability, what he looks upon as the sure means of subduing us to his power; of making our country a department, or, perhaps, vice-royalty, of his vast empire.——Such, however, has been the uniform practice of nations. When pressed hard from without; when exposed to all sorts of suffering at home; instead of resorting to the means of removing the danger, they have, in almost every instance, increased it by their own conduct, and, particularly by quarrels amongst those, whose duty bade them make any sacrifice for the purpose of setting an example of unanimity.——The people will bear in mind, that they have been called upon daily, for the last fifteen or sixteen years; that they have, in fact, been worried half to death with exhortations, not to mention the *threats* that have been uttered; and, for what? Why, to be *unanimous*; and, now, at last, they have a very pretty example of that unanimity, which, as they have been told, is necessary to our existence as a nation.——Napoleon, though Messieurs Canning, Ellis, and Frere, laughed at his *bad spelling*; Napoleon, though never " Captain of Eton," and unable, perhaps, to make a pun, or

an antithesis; Napoleon knows very well what this duel indicates. He will pay much more attention to it than he will to the next Speech from the throne; it speaks in a language not to be misunderstood; and, what makes it peculiarly valuable to him, he is *sure* that it speaks the truth.——I before observed upon the *crime*, which, in the eye of the laws of England, these men committed, upon the supposition, that they did actually fight the duel which they are stated to have fought upon Putney Heath; and, I am much obliged to a writer in the Morning Chronicle of Friday last, for having placed this part of the subject in a very clear and forcible light. I shall here insert his observations, beseeching the readers' attention to them:——"By "Stat. 43 G. III. c. 58. s. 1. the wilfully, "maliciously, and unlawfully shooting at, "&c. any of his majesty's subjects, with "an intent, in so doing, to murder, maim, "disfigure, or disable, or to do some other "grievous bodily hurt to such subject, is "declared to be a felony without benefit "of clergy, and the offender is adjudged "to be punished by death.——There is "a proviso in the statute, that if such act "of shooting, &c. be committed under "such circumstances as that, if death en-"sued, it would not in law have amounted "to the crime of murder, any person "committing such act, and indicted under "the statute, shall be acquitted. From "this proviso it seems that, in every case "in which the acts mentioned in the sta-"tute would amount in law to murder, if "death ensue, they amount to FELONY "within the statute, *if death do not ensue;* "and therefore, as the killing a man in a "duel is held in law to be murder (of "which we had last year a melancholy "example), the shooting at a man in a "duel, when death does not ensue, must "be a felony within the above statute: "and, by consequence, *Lord Castlereagh "and Mr. Canning are felons within the "meaning of the act, if they fought the duel "at Putney it is said they did.* Yet although "their offence was published in all the "public newspapers, with the names of "the witnesses, and every necessary parti-"cular to prove the offence against them, "*they still remain at large*, and no warrant "has been issued for their apprehension "either by the magistrates of Surrey or "others having the power to do so.——I "should not have noticed this subject, as "I neither admire the above statute, nor "am disposed in the present state of things "to punish duellists by death, but for the "very recent case of Mr. Eliston, under "the very same statute: This person was "apprehended and subsequently com-"mitted to take his trial under this statute, "although the only witness present and "person injured, acquits him of any inten-"tion of doing her any bodily hurt. In "this I do not blame the magistrate—he "did his duty in apprehending Mr. Elis-"ton, and also in subsequently com-"mitting him for trial, as he was not satis-"fied of his innocence; *but I say that the "same sense of duty which led that magistrate "to apprehend Mr. Eliston, obliges him to "apprehend the other two offenders.* The "case of Mr. Eliston is but a case of "*suspicion*, whilst that of lord Castlereagh "and Mr. Canning, if true, is one of *cer-"tainty of offence;* and therefore, in my "mind, it will be flagrant injustice if the "former is further proceeded against while "the latter are permitted to escape with "impunity.—The administration of jus-"tice should, perhaps, be strict, unques-"tionably it should be equal; but where "there are several offenders against the "same law, to punish one and to take no "notice of the others is not equal. In-"equality in the administration of justice "is not only censurable in a moral point "of view, but it is dangerous to society; "for *how can it be expected or required that "any individual should suffer patiently if "others are permitted to commit the same "offence for which he suffers with impunity;* "and the inequality is more offensive "where there is a disparity in the rank of "the parties, for *the appearance* in such "case is, that the superior rank is the "shelter from punishment.—In making "the above observations I am only ac-"tuated with a desire to see the justice of "the country impartially administered. I "have no knowledge of Mr. E. neither "have I a wish to see Lord C. and Mr. "C. punished under the statute they have "apparently offended against; neither "should I have wished to have seen the "survivor punished for murder, if either "had been killed; although, at the same "time, I cannot but observe, that in such "case the survivor could not have *com-"plained of the severity*, as it was *during his "administration that all mercy was refused in "the unfortunate case of Major Campbell.*" ——This gentleman, as well as myself, was, it now seems, both writing upon this same point, just about the same moment.

The case of Major Campbell struck me so forcibly at the time, that I could not help citing it. Nothing is clearer than that, if Lord Castlereagh and his brother Right Honourable Privy Counsellor did, as it has been so often and so publicly stated, actually shoot at one another in a duel, they are both guilty of FELONY; that they are both FELONS; and yet, so void of all decency are the hirelings of the press, that they do not scruple to hold out, that it would be proper for these men, these felons in the eye of the law, again to become ministers; again to associate with the king in person at his council-board! Nothing can more strongly characterize the state in which we are than the publishing of a thought of this sort. What opinion must these hirelings have of the public mind; what must they think of the people, amidst whom they promulgate a proposition like this?——Yes, as this writer observes, what is to be said of our justice; of our administration of justice, if this duel pass unnoticed thereby? The case of Mr. Eliston is very striking; that of Major Campbell more so; but, neither of them more in point than was, last Spring, that of *the poor Tinman of Plymouth.*——There does not want the acting upon the suggestion of the hirelings and the taking into the ministry, one or the other, or both, of these pistolers. There does not want any thing of this kind. The whole thing was complete long enough ago. But, it would be something *new*. It would be a little additional garnish, though it would make no alteration in the dish itself.

THE CHANGE OF MINISTRY, as it is called, does not appear to be decided upon. It seems, that those, who choose to remain in, wish to coalesce with some of the *outs*. The scheme is not a bad one, but the *outs*, as it would seem, will not coalesce. I said, they would not. They think, that, if they hold out but a little longer, those who are now in place will find it absolutely necessary to give way, notwithstanding any patching that may, in the meanwhile, take place.——Why, let me see: I think it would be best for *the country*, for them to make a GRAND COALITION; a famous coalition. How delightful it would be to see *Popery* and *No-Popery* close in each others embraces!——The Morning Chronicle is quite melting upon the subject of his "*two distinguished statesmen.*" Won't coalesce, won't they? What, then, Lord Grey did not coalesce with Lord Grenville, did he not? And both did not coalesce with the Addingtons? How shy they are become; how coy, all of a sudden. The Foxites, I warrant you, did not coalesce with Pitt, whom they had, for twenty years, been representing as the worst enemy of England? No, they did not coalesce with him; and why? *because he would not coalesce with them.* But, they coalesced with his memory, and voted the payment of his debts upon the ground of his "*public services,*" expressly acknowledged by them.—They do well, for themselves, however, not to coalesce *now*: for, so sure as they do, so sure they are tumbled out, neck and heels, in the space of a month or two, and the few friends they have left will shun them, as they would shun the Walcheren fever, or any thing the most pestiferous and loathsome.——There is one expression in the Morning Chronicle, which, if it be not considered as a slip of the pen, is well calculated to attract attention. After giving the names of the new-moulded ministry, it says: "This is the new plan. It certainly is "not an extended and combined adminis-"tration; but they (the ministers) hope, "that, in the PRESENT STATE OF THE "REPRESENTATION OF THE COUN-"TRY, even this may *go down*; and they "do not hesitate to say, that, by striking "out the *intellect* that was amongst them, "they may proceed without contrariety "of sentiment."——Now, what are we to make of this? Its meaning cannot be misunderstood. Well, then, Sir, are you, and are your party, *for any change, or reform, in the representation of the country?* This is a question of vital importance; because, if you are for such change, you are the men we want. Only tell us, that, if put into power, you will bring forward the measure of a change in the representation of the country, and we are all for you, to a man. "*Go down;*" aye, to be sure it will, and why should it not? Did not Mr. Canning's motion for the acquittal of his "noble *friend,*" Lord Castlereagh, *go down;* and, did it not go down very well too? And, when Mr. Madocks brought forward his motion about the seat-selling to Mr. Quintin Dick, and the bargain about Mr. Dick's voting, did not a motion, made to set Mr. Madocks's motion aside, and to prevent all inquiry, go down as smoothly as oil? And did not your party most cordially join in the said stifling motion, and also in the ever-famous cry of "*make a stand*"? Oh, yes; all this went

down, not with the *majority* only, but, with your party; with that very party, in whose behalf you are now complaining of the "state of the *representation* of the "country," which state of the representation, by the bye, your great partizans, the Edinburgh Reviewers, declare to be essential to *regular* liberty. Aye, aye; you are *now* out of humour with the "present state of the representation of the "country," though you called us Jacobins and Levellers for wishing that state altered. You dislike the state of the representation, because, just at this time, it operates to the keeping of you and your friends out of place; but, when you were in place, you shunned, as you would have shunned a pestilence, all those who endeavoured to make you recollect your pledges about Parliamentary Reform.—— Surely, you cannot mean to complain of the present parliament merely as contrasted with *yours?* Is this it? Is the change, which you would make in the state of the representation, merely such a change as you wrought in 1806; that is to say, by the dissolution, which gave you a majority in the House of Commons? If this be the only change which your party has in contemplation, why, really, all those, who do not wish for a treat in muddy beer, would rather that things should remain as they are.——In the same article, speaking of the rivalship for place between Mr. Perceval and Mr. Canning, the writer states, that "it ought to be known that the real "contest was between him and Mr. Perceval. On the Duke of Portland's re"signation he stated to his colleagues that "it was impossible to *carry on the busi*"*ness of the House of Commons* with a "divided and unsettled *leader*. Either "Mr. Perceval or himself must have the "sole and *decided lead of the Government* "*business*. Now, of the two, he thought "that he had the better claim to the dis"tinction from the superior attention which "he had received for the last two years, "and from his *influence in the House*."—— Such is the language of this man, who, in another part of the very same article, *complains* of "the present state of the repre"sentation of the country." He talks (as of a thing *of course*) of a minister's carrying on "the business of the House of "Commons;" he talks of a *leader* in carrying on that business, as he would of the foreman of a shop; and, in short, represents the House of Commons as a mere tool, as a mere manageable thing, in the hands of a minister. Why, if this be the case, and if it be so to remain, what need we care a straw who is in power, and who out of power? What need we care which faction rules us, if we are to be thus treated? And, what need we care who are in the House of Commons? This is pretty language, and coming from those, too, who are *complaining* of "the present "state of the representation," by which they clearly mean, a House of Commons in which they have not a decided, settled majority.——"The *business* of the House "of Commons," indeed! So this man, who wants us to clamour for a change of ministry, coolly tells us, that Mr. Canning and Mr. Perceval quarrelled for the post of "carrying on the business of the House "of Commons."——No, no: we shall not be hallooed on to call for any such change as this gentleman has in contemplation; we shall not be induced to follow his advice, "to hold *meetings*, hum"bly to represent to his Majesty" our apprehensions as to the dangers, "with "which the present state of things is preg"nant." No, no: we shall not hold meetings to obtain a choice of a man to "*carry on the business* of the House of Com"mons;" and, as to the "*dreadful* arrears of "the Property Tax," of which the Chronicle tells us the *present ministers* are about to enforce the collection, we cannot help remembering, that the tax itself was almost doubled by those very men, whom we are requested to pray the king to recal to his councils.——No: we will not budge an inch for any such purpose. We feel no interest in any such change as that which has been talked of. It is not the difference of a straw's value to the people of England which faction has the predominance. "*Meetings*," indeed! Did the Whigs favour the last meetings that were held through the country? And, amongst all the enemies of Mr. Wardle, the very bitterest of all; he whose print has dealt forth the most venom, and what contained the most artful and the most base misrepresentations, is the conductor of the Morning Chronicle.—— If, indeed, this party were to declare explicitly, that the state of the country demanded a thorough *reform*, in all the departments, and especially in the Commons' House of Parliament, then there would be some cause for our wishing to see them in power; but, for any thing that I have seen or heard, I should as soon expect a reform from the present men as from those who

wish to turn them out and get into their places.

TALAVERA'S BATTLE.——I have, upon a former occasion, given my opinion as to the utility of watching narrowly the occurrences in Spain, and of putting upon record, as they come out, all the material facts, relative to the campaign of the Baron of the Douro and the "Viscount "of Talavera and of Wellington in the said "county." This campaign will be a thing to be remembered, especially when considered in conjunction with the *titles* that have arisen out of it. This campaign involves the character of the army of Spain and that of England; it puts much to the test; it makes an English General and an English army witnesses, and makes them *give evidence*, as to the *humanity* of the French generals and the French army. It exhibits a great and mighty *Indian* conqueror pitted against European soldiers. ——My last article, upon this subject, will be found at page 385 of the present Volume, and the others in the Numbers immediately preceding. —— *Cuesta's* account of the Battle of Talavera has long been a thing much wished-for. At last it is come, and has been published in *some* of the London prints, but, which is well worthy of remark, not in the *hired* prints, a thing very scandalous indeed, especially when it is recollected, that this general Cuesta has had some very severe censure bestowed upon him in the dispatches from the Baron of the Douro, *published by our government.*——In this Number, if possible, and, if not in this, in my next, I will insert the whole of this dispatch of General Cuesta; but, I shall here introduce some part of it, that the reader may have the most material points at once under his eye.—— There were with respect to the battle of Talavera, two points of great interest, which, after all, remained unsettled; namely, 1st, *Whether our army was attacked by superior numbers*, and, 2nd, *Whether the Spanish army took a part in the battle.*—— Now, it has never been pretended, that the army of the Duke of Belluno was superior, or even equal in numbers to the Spanish and English army *united*. Indeed, the fact has clearly been proved to the contrary. The army of Cuesta alone was equal in numbers to that of the French, unless the accounts given us of that army, previous to the battle, were totally false. ——Besides, the Duke of Belluno had been, and was to the very day before the battle, *pursued* by the combined armies; and it does no where appear, that he was joined by any reinforcements of more than about 10,000 men.——No: our general has, all along, taken special care not to give us any account of his own numbers, or of those of the Spanish army. He drily tells us, that he was attacked by *double his numbers*; but supports this statement by no statement of actual numbers.——The *French* told us, that their army amounted to about 40,000, and that the combined armies amounted to more than 80,000. Here is, I dare say, some exaggeration; but, on the other hand, I think, that no man who is desirous of being regarded as having any love for truth; that no man, who does not belong to that set amongst us, who wish to be deceived, or to deceive others; with the exception of persons like these, I think, that there is no man, who will pretend to doubt of the *combined* army having been greatly superior in numbers to that of the French.——If the reader thinks with me upon this point, the next thing we have to inquire into, is, whether the Spaniards took any, and if any, what, part in the battle.——The Baron of the Douro gave us, in his account of the battle, a very laconic and remarkably dry description of the feats performed by the Spanish part of the army in that battle. I have since contrasted that account with the letter of Cuesta to the Junta and his Orders to his army, which documents will be found in pages 293 and 294 of the present volume. From these, it would seem, that the Spanish army had their full share of the battle. I do not mean, that they had, in proportion to their numbers, as much to do in the battle as our army had; but, it would appear, that they were *engaged*, a fact by no means to be inferred from the dispatch of the Baron of the Douro and the Viscount of Talavera and of Wellington in the said county, the said dispatch speaking of the Spaniards in these words ——"Your lordship will observe, "that the attacks of the enemy were prin- "cipally, if not ENTIRELY, directed "against the British troops. The Spanish "Commander in Chief, his officers, and "troops, manifested every *disposition* to "render us assistance, and those of them, "that *were* engaged, *did their duty*; but, "the ground which they occupied was "so important, and its front, at the same "time, so difficult, that I did not think "it proper to urge them to make any "movement to the left of the enemy, "while he was engaged with us."——In

one place he says, speaking of a particular attack: "this attack was most success-
"fully repulsed by Brigadier General
"Campbell, *supported* by the *King's regi-*
"*ment of Spanish cavalry* and *two battalions*
"*of Spanish infantry*; and Brigadier Gene-
"ral Campbell took the enemy's cannon.
"The brigadier mentions particularly the
"conduct of the 97th, 7th, and 53rd regi-
"ments." But, here is not a word said in praise of either the cavalry, or infantry, of the Spaniards. In another place, he just observes, that an attack of the enemy's cavalry upon the Spanish infantry *failed*.——Now, reader, these, as you must recollect, are all the passages, wherein mention is made of the Spaniards having had *any hand at all* in the battle; and, so, keeping our own numbers studiously out of sight, we say, that, as the Spaniards merely *looked on*, we had all the fighting to do, and that we fought with *double our* numbers.——Let us now hear Cuesta, then.——No one will attempt to deny, that, when this dispatch arrived in England, every man looked upon it as conveying the meaning, that the Spaniards had no share in gaining the "victory." ——Let us, then, hear Cuesta!——Nay, the General Orders to our army, issued in the king's name, asserted, "that the ene-
"my directed his *whole* efforts" [meaning, doubtless, *the whole of his efforts*] "against
"the troops of his Majesty; that the
"British army sustained *nearly the whole*
"*weight* of this great contest; and *has* ac-
"quired the glory of having vanquished
"a French army nearly double *their* num-
"bers." This is, in more ways than one, making pretty free with the *king's English*; but, here is the old story again repeated. ——Let us, then, hear Cuesta!——Why need I dwell upon it, however, when it is notorious, that there was not a public print in London, which did not crack its jokes upon the immobility of the Spanish part of the army, and which, in short, did not embody into *direct charges* all that could be inferred from the official dispatches. ——Let us now hear Cuesta, then!——I am sure, that the reader, be he who he may, must remember the self-complacent observations that passed, in all companies, upon the receipt of Douro's dispatch, and how many and many "good things" were said, over the tea as well as over the bottle, upon the conduct of the poor Spaniards.——Come, then, let us now hear Cuesta!——His dispatch is published by order of the Spanish Junta. It contains an account of the operations of his army for some time previous to the battle. He then comes to the battle itself, and, after having spoken of the preparatory dispositions, he thus recounts the occurrences of the engagement. "As dusk approached,
"he commenced a furious attack by a
"cannonade, and a charge *by the whole of*
"*his cavalry, on the right, occupied by the*
"*Spanish infantry, with the apparent design*
"*of breaking through our ranks*, posted as I
"have before described. This attack was
"received by an active fire perfectly well
"sustained, both of cannon and musketry,
"which *disconcerted the purpose of the ene-*
"*my, and put him to flight at a quarter past*
"*eight*. During this time, a strong divi-
"sion of the French advanced by the val-
"ley to the left of the height, occupied
"by the English general Hill, of which,
"with very great loss, they obtained a
"momentary possession, but Hill returned
"to the charge presently with the bayo-
"net, drove off the enemy, and recovered
"his ground. In the night the French
"repeated their attack, but without suc-
"ceeding, and with great loss. At break
"of day on the 28th they returned with
"two divisions of infantry, but they were
"repulsed by the brave Hill, who could
"not be intimidated by their repeated at-
"tempts, or by the progressive accumu-
"lation of the forces of the assailants.——
"General Wellesley, in consequence of
"these renewed exertions of the enemy
"by the valley, on the left side of the
"height, ordered thither two brigades of
"his cavalry, supported by lieutenant
"general the duke of Alburquerque, with
"the whole of his division of cavalry.
"The French, seeing this movement, sent
"sharp-shooters into the chain of moun-
"tains to the left of the valley, *who were*
"*attacked by the 5th division of my infantry*
"*under Marshal de Camp Don Luis Basse-*
"*court, who dislodged them with much loss.*
"——The general attack commenced by
"the advance of different columns of the
"enemy's infantry, with the intention of
"attacking the height occupied by gene-
"ral Hill. These columns were charged
"by two parties of English dragoons,
"under the command of general Anson,
"led by lieutenant general Payne, and
"supported by the brigade of cavalry of
"the line of general Tanne. One of these
"regiments of English dragoons suffered
"very much; but this spirited charge
"had the effect of disconcerting the de-
"signs of the enemy, who sustained a very

" great loss. At the same time, the " French attacked the centre of the army, " where the English general Campbell " was stationed, *having on his right lieute-* " *nant general Don Francisco de Eguia,* the " enemy was driven back *by both these ge-* " *nerals,* who had *their infantry supported* " *by the King's regiment of cavalry, and by the* " *division of lieutenant general Don Juan de* " *Henestrosa. This corps covered itself with* " *glory, in the charge that it made on the in-* " *fantry of the enemy, during which it turned* " *the column by which it was assailed; under* " *which aavantage, the English infantry, pro-* " *tected by the Spanish, possessed themselves of* " *the artillery of the enemy.* At the same " time with these proceedings, the French " attacked with fury the centre of the " English army, commanded by general " Sherbrooke. The foes were received " with extraordinary courage, and were " driven back by the whole English " division, with charged bayonets. But " the English brigade of guards, which " was carried onward precipitately in the " ardour of battle, advanced too far, and " was in consequence obliged to withdraw " under the fire of the second line, com- " posed of the brigade of cavalry of gene- " ral Cotton, and of a battalion of infantry " detached from the height by gen. Wel- " lesley, as soon as he observed the re- " mote situation of the guards. General " Howarth who commanded the English " artillery, was distinguished for his ex- " traordinary courage, and performed the " most important services.——Lieutenant " general Don Francisco de Eguia, my " second in command, was posted on my " left, with the 3rd, 4th, and 5th divisions, " under generals the marquis de Portago, " Don Rafael Manglano, and Don Louis " Alexandro Bassecourt, but the latter was " ordered to support the division of caval- " ry of lieutenant-general the duke of " Alburquerque, which was detached to " reinforce the British army. The dis- " patches No. 4, 5, and 6, from these gene- " rals are inclosed for the information of " his majesty.——I took under my parti- " cular orders the centre and the right, with- " out neglecting, however, the superintend- " ance of the rest, and with much satisfac- " tion I noticed the conduct of the generals " of the 1st and 2d division, of the marquis " de Zayas, and Don Vicente Iglesias, as " well as Don Juan Berhuy, and lieutenant- " general Don Juan Henestrosa, &c.—— " The loss of the enemy was very great. " They left on the field of battle from 4 to " 5,000 men, and the number of their " wounded is computed at 5,000 more. Two " or three generals were killed and several " wounded, and at least 400 other officers. " We have taken 19 pieces of artillery, and " many waggons of ammunition, and the " rout was one of the most complete, con- " sidering that we were acting on the de- " fensive. The English have lost gene- " ral Mackenzie, brigadier-general Lang- " worth, and other officers of distinguished " rank and merit. The total of their " officers, killed and wounded, is 260, " and that of their rank and file 5,000, " our diminution is much less. *Don Ra-* " *fael Manglano was wounded, and* 50 *more* " *of our officers were killed and wounded, and* " 1,150 *rank and file.* Our artillery was " served with ability and fortitude, and " the names of such officers, whose talents " were most conspicuously displayed, are " mentioned in the dispatches from the " respective generals.——I should be neg- " ligent of my own duty, if I did not com- " municate to your excellency, for the in- " formation of his majesty, that the con- " duct of the British general in chief, sir " Arthur Wellesley, and that of the gene- " rals, subordinate officers, and soldiers " under his command, is above all praise. " I have seen the enthusiasm with which " these faithful allies have in copious " streams poured forth their blood in the " defence of our liberty, and no language " can adequately express the sentiments of " gratitude with which our breasts are " animated. With the highest satisfac- " tion I have noticed my army hailing our " companions for the victory obtained, " and mingling with exclamations indica- " tive of the warmest affection, the appel- " latives of our country, and Ferdinand, " with those of our powerful and generous " allies."——It is quite unnecessary to point out the wide difference between the language of this Spanish general towards our general and his army, and the lan- guage of our general towards the Spanish general and the Spanish army; for, it must strike every one, though, with all who reflect upon the character of the par- ties, this difference will be less a subject of surprize than of shame. Let the readers of the hireling prints, when they have read this dispatch of Cuesta, look back, if they can without shame, at the endless strings of paragraphs, published respecting that general after the receipt of Douro's dis- patch.——But, it is the *facts* that we ought now to look after. The Spanish Com-

mander in Chief has now written, and the Spanish government have published to the world that the Spaniards *had* a share, and a very considerable share, in what was done at Talavera; that they fought, that they fought much and hard; that they had many officers, who greatly distinguished themselves; and, finally, that they had considerable numbers *killed* and *wounded*, though they do not speak of any "*missing*."——Let us look at this dispatch a little more in detail, bearing in mind, as we proceed, that Baron Douro and Lord Viscount of Talavera and of Wellington in the said county, explicitly states, that the attacks of the French were principally, "if not "ENTIRELY," directed against the British troops, which statement was repeated in our king's General Order to the army, as above quoted.—Now, then, let us hear Cuesta!——He says, and his government has published to the world, FIRST; that the French made a furious attack by a cannonade and a charge by the whole of their cavalry, on the right, occupied by the Spanish infantry, and that this attack was gallantly and successfully resisted by the Spaniards, who put the assailants to flight. —SECONDLY; that the French sharp-shooters were attacked by the 5th division of Spanish infantry, under Don Louis Bassecourt, who dislodged the sharp-shooters with much loss.—THIRD; that the French, having attacked the English under General Campbell, who had the Spanish under Don Eguia on his right, were driven back by *both* these generals; that this body of infantry was supported by a regiment of Spanish cavalry, under Don Henestrosa, which Spanish regiment covered itself with glory; that it got in the rear of the French column by which it was attacked; and that it was owing to the advantage *thus* given to the English infantry under Campbell and the Spanish infantry under Eguia, that they were enabled to take the French cannon.——Now, upon this part of the statement, we must look back a little at Baron Douro's dispatch. He says: "This "attack was most successfully repulsed by "Brig. Gen. Campbell, *supported* by the "King's regiment of Spanish cavalry, and "by two battalions of Spanish infantry; "and *Brig. Gen. Campbell* took the enemy's "cannon." Mind how pointed the expression. This General Campbell was merely *supported*; and it is *he* who takes the cannon. Cuesta says, on the contrary, that the Spanish infantry were in line with the English; and, as to the cavalry, he says that they doubled round the enemy, got in the rear of their flank, and enabled the English and Spanish infantry to take the cannon. Baron-Douro-of-Wellesley-in-the-county-of-Somerset,-and-Viscount-Talavera-and-of-Wellington-in-the-said-county, did not, as the reader will perceive, even mention the *names* of the Spanish officers, who were thus engaged, though, on the score of length of name, he certainly does not yield to any Spaniard living. Poor gentlemen; he might, one would think, have just done them the immortal honour to write their names. What must Don Eguia and Don Henestrosa think of this?——FOURTH; the Spanish general asserts, and the Spanish government publishes to the world, that, in this battle, in which our public prints have stedfastly asserted, that the Spaniards had *no share whatever*; that, in this battle, the Spanish army had, in KILLED AND WOUNDED, *fifty-one officers* and *one thousand one hundred and fifty rank and file*.——Now, we must either give this assertion the *lie direct*, or, we must acknowledge, that the Spanish army *had* a share in the battle, and that the "*whole* ef-"forts of the enemy" were *not* directed against the British troops.——Reader, if you are not one of the millions of wretches, who dare not say what they think; if you are not one of the last-ditch and life-and-fortune men; if you are not one of those, who have disgusted all Europe with English bragging; if you have a mind yet undebased by the corruptions of the day, tell me frankly, do you believe Cuesta? I will tell you my mind freely: I *do* believe him; because I think it next to impossible, that a lie so impudent should have been hatched by him, and, if hatched by him, published by the government.——But, if what he says be *true*, where are we to look for that *disparity of numbers*, of which the Baron of the Douro told us?——Reader, how came it that my Lord Douro said not a word, in his dispatches, in any of his dispatches, from the first to the last, about the *killed and wounded of the Spaniards*? You see, that General Cuesta informs his government of our killed and wounded, mentions the principal officers by name, and, which merited a better return, he says not a word about *our missing*; while my Lord Douro takes no more notice of the Spanish killed and wounded, than he does of the fact, stated by Cuesta, of the Spanish cavalry having been the cause of taking the French cannon that were taken. Are we

to believe, then, that there were no Spanish killed and wounded. Oh, no! We *cannot* believe it; and if the hirelings *pretend* to believe it, what will they say more to induce us to make war along with such an army and for such a government as those of Spain?——Let the hirelings choose; let the Ferdinand VII.-men; let the holy-altar-men and life-and-fortune-men choose; let them say, that the Spanish account of the battle *is true*, or let them say it *is false*. Just which they please; for, upon one horn or the other we have them. Will they say, that the Spanish Commander in Chief and the Spanish government are such impudent liars as to pretend that they had 51 officers and 1,150 rank and file, *killed* and *wounded* in the battle of Talavera, while the attacks of the enemy "were principally, *if* "*not* ENTIRELY, directed against the "British troops?" Will they say this; or will they say, that Baron-Douro-of-Wellesley-in-the-county-of-Somerset-and-Viscount-of-Talavera-and-of-Wellington-in-the-said-county had *not* to fight the French army single handed; and that "the *whole efforts* of the enemy," in the language of the General Order, were *not* directed against the English.——In short, nothing can be more clear than this, that Cuesta's statement, and especially his return of killed and wounded, must be contradicted, and not only contradicted, but *disproved*, before any man of common sense will agree to consider the Spanish army *as not making part of the force, attacked by the Duke of Belluno*, under the eye of Joseph Napoleon. There is no man in his senses that can possibly so consider it, unless this statement of Cuesta be completely done away; unless Cuesta be convicted of being a liar and a braggart, and his government convicted of giving currency to his lies, under their authority and name. For, are there fifty officers killed and wounded, and upwards of a thousand rank and file killed and wounded, and is the army suffering that loss *not engaged?* Never was there any proposition so void of all reason and decency.——Our Lord of the Douro seems to have considered the whole of the French as engaged with *his* army; but, supposing, that not a man of the Spaniards had been either killed or wounded; supposing every word that Cuesta has uttered, upon the subject, to be false; what then? It proves that the Spaniards had no fighting to do; but, it by no means proves, that their *presence* was not an injury to the French. In short, it is perfect madness to believe, that the French general would send his whole force against one part of the army, and leave himself exposed to be surrounded by the other part. Cuesta says, that the Frenchman did no such thing; but, on the contrary, that he commenced the action with a furious attack *upon the Spaniards*, with the whole of his cavalry, as well as with a part of his cannon. This was rational. This was what is likely to have been; and yet we, here, in England, have the impudence to crow over the poor Spaniards, and to represent them as mere stones or posts, stuck up on the field of battle.—— This way of estimating the relative force of an army is perfectly original, unless, indeed, it be borrowed from the wars in *Hindostan*. Why, then, suppose we should, hereafter, meet a French army with an army altogether English. Suppose each side to have forty thousand men; but, that, owing to some circumstance or other, only *one half* of our army were engaged. Should we have the impudence to say, that we had to fight against *double our numbers?* We might. I'll not answer for it that we should not. But, would not the world laugh at us? Would they not call us empty braggarts?——This letter of Cuesta appears to me to settle the point respecting the relative numbers engaged in the battle, unless what he asserts be *disproved*. If his dispatch contains falshoods, those falshoods should be contradicted, and *officially* too, without loss of time. I must repeat, that I believe him, because he speaks so much in detail, gives us names and other particulars, and grudges not his good word either to our general or our army; and, in short, until I see it clearly disproved, I shall continue to believe, and so will the public, every word of it, let the conclusion, to which it leads, be what it will.

AUSTRIA.——The hirelings are actually pricking up their ears again upon the sight of a Proclamation of the Emperor Francis, purporting that he is prepared for war again. I should suppose this document to be a fabrication from the mill of some of the French emigrants now in London. But, for once, my wishes accord with those of the hirelings. I wish, with all my heart, that Mr. Gentz, or some of that set, may prevail upon the Emperor Francis to go to war again. I want to see him at war once more, and, I was very sorry indeed to hear of the

suspension of arms. It is for the good of mankind, and especially for us, in England, that the Emperor Francis should have one more bout with Buonaparté and his Dukes. It is high time for the Emperor Francis to "*make a stand.*"——But really, there are parts of the Emperor Francis's proclamation, at which one cannot help staring. For instance, where he talks about the enemy's having "learned to appreciate the *public spirit* "of his *people*, and the *valour of his ar-* "*mies*," and says, the *enemy* has "*dearly* "*bought* the knowledge, that he (the Em- "peror Francis) is constantly solicitous "to promote the prosperity of his domi- "nions." Really one can hardly believe one's eyes. This must be a fabrication; and yet, why should it? Have not all the now-fallen governments gone on in the same way? Have they not all proceeded, to the very last moment, in the very course which was the cause of their overthrow, though the final consequences were so frequently placed before their eyes?——A few weeks, however, will now decide the fate of Austria, and, in all probability, of the other countries and states in the Eastern part of the continent of Europe.

WM. COBBETT.

Botley, 5 Oct. 1809.

STATE OF SPAIN.—*(continued from p. 444.)*

The whole herbage of Spain, corn-lands as well as grass-grounds, are subjected, twice a year, to the legal depredations of several millions of travelling sheep, in which the miserable agriculturists have no interest whatever. Nay, more, every species of provender which the poor farmers save for their own live stock, in the interim of the fatal spring and autumn visits of these all-devouring flocks, can be, and is demanded, (legally, you observe, all according to law,) at a fixed price, and that price fixed by the owners of these flocks. But, I ask, what price can indemnify a farmer for the privation of the means of supporting his labouring and other live-stock, on his farm? on the condition of which depends his ability to perform every operation for its improvement. No durable inclosure can be made in Spain, except around gardens and vineyards. Even these were laid open to the flocks, previous to 1788. Add to these intolerable oppressions the arbitrary and capricious taxes on every description of the produce of the soil, (grain now excepted) imposed, not by a legislative body chosen by the community, for, in this country of Spain there is nobody of this nature, not imposed by the government, despotic as it is; but by the mean, self-interested municipalities of the different towns to which the several articles of butchers-meat, poultry, wine, oil, fruits, garden-stuffs, &c. are brought for sale. The consequence of all this is, that there is not a province in Spain where there are not many estates in a manner deserted, without inhabitants; devoid of trees, irrigation or improvement of any sort. Over the whole country, agriculture is abandoned to the poorest and most ignorant husbandmen. The capitalist every where leaving the country in search of more lucrative employment. So many arbitrary taxes do the necessaries of life pay from the moment of their existence to that of their consumption; so tormented are the lieges with the innumerable corps of guards, visitors, officers, &c. for the collection of the provincial imposts; so torn to pieces are they with denunciations, procedures, arrests, detentions, &c. to which the smallest and most innocent mistake gives occasion, that the citizen can neither move nor stand still without being surrounded with commissaries, guards, &c. who keeps him in vexation and poverty during the whole of his life. —Is it in defence of such a system as this, (in the overthrow of which every heart not imbued to the core with the deepest dies of despotism and misanthropy must rejoice) is it in defence of a policy like this, I say, calculated to debase, and even gradually extirpate the human race, that Englishmen are to expend their blood and treasure? Shall the sons of Liberty prop the rotten pillars of oppression? support the selfish, narrowminded Junta, who give no hopes of better days to the people of Spain, even when the French are expelled? The Junta, in which we perceive several of the very men whose partial oppressive policy, heretofore destroying the energies of her people, encouraged Buonaparté to attempt the subjugation of the peninsula.—Your constant reader, PHILALETHES.

FOREIGN MINISTERS.

Sir; In running over the huge Report of the Finance Committee published in July 1808, my attention was attracted by the

numerous List of unemployed Foreign Ministers, who are now a burthen on the public purse. I am not one of those who disapprove of a due and reasonable provision being made for those who have devoted their lives to the public service, especially in a branch of it where the salaries, not being more than adequate to the necessary expences of the station, afford no means of laying up any provision for old age or infirmity; neither should I object generally to the amount of the provision which has been made in these instances, if my information be correct as to the difference between the apparent amount, as stated in the report, and the real amount received, the latter being, as I am told, about two thirds only of the former (what becomes of this difference?); but I may possibly, in a future letter, observe upon some particular cases, which bear very strong marks of jobs, or in which the remuneration far exceeds the length and importance of the service performed. For the present, I shall content myself with adverting to the extraordinary circumstance of new persons having been selected of late for foreign stations, whilst the old ones continue thus burthensome on the revenue. The selections I refer to, are too recent to need being pointed at, and they could not have been motived by any previous trial of the respective capacities of the persons selected, in as much as these persons, as far as I can learn, were never before employed.—Now, Sir, if the old ministers, who figure on this pension list, are all of them unfit for the discharge of the duties of the stations to which the new men have been appointed; if none could be found in this list who are capable of managing the national concerns at Cagliari, Lisbon, Sicily, &c. then there must have been a most lamentable want of discernment, or something worse, in the predecessors of the present secretary of state, by whom these incapable men were so improperly thrust into public employments; and the pensions which have been granted to them are a most reprehensible waste of the public money. But if, on the other hand, these pensioned ministers are still able to execute the duties of their profession, either better or even as well as the "young friends" (for the right honourable secretary treads in the early steps of his prototype Pitt in drawing satellites around him); if, I say, the old ministers are more capable or as capable as the young friends whom the rays of the right honourable secretary's favour have illumined and vivified, then the preference of these latter is at once an act of gross injustice to the former, whose claims had a stronger foundation in past services, and to the public, who thus become most unnecessarily burthened with a large additional expence, without the prospect of being more profitably served. Leaving the right honourable secretary on the horns of this dilemma, I remain, Sir, his and your obedient Servant, B.

Mr. WARDLE.

Sir; The following Letter was sent for insertion in the Morning Chronicle, a few days after the communication appeared which gave rise to it. By that impartial Journal it was deemed inadmissible: but as it attempts a defence of some opinions contained in your Political Register, from the misrepresentations of its calumniators, a space perhaps may be there afforded it in defect of better materials.

To the Editor of the Morning Chronicle.

Sir; In your paper of the 8th of September, I find a long and elaborate communication, on the subject of "Colonel Wardle's Trial," from a correspondent, who subscribes himself "a Lover of Truth." The lucubrations of this writer must be deemed the more valuable, as they are, confessedly, the production of a mind habitually conversant in the arts of logomachy, and practised in the wiles of disputation; of one, who, though living in a remote part of the country, is yet accustomed "weekly to read the papers and "to discuss the politics of the day, at a "club which assembles every Saturday "night." Whether the present be the first effort, on the part of these illustrious statesmen, to give publicity to their patriotic vigils, we are not told: In mercy to mankind, we hope it will not be the last; but that, emulating a like institution, whose proceedings they will find detailed with impressive solemnity in "Memoirs of P. P." a distinguished rural politician, their consultations may gain the ear of ministry, and direct the operations of legislature. —Not content, however, with simply disclosing his alliance with this respectable assembly, your correspondent condescendingly admits us to participate their councils: and gives us to understand, that he, "and some others, who constituted a very small minority at the weekly meetings,"

have maintained a long, laborious, but at length successful struggle against their numerous and prejudiced associates. Indeed, he seems wonderfully to congratulate himself on the peculiar felicity of his discernment. He appears to have been favoured, for some mysterious purpose, no doubt, with a spirit of political second sight; to have harboured suspicions "for which he could assign no cause; and to have detected the fermentations of revenge and conspiracy, when they escaped the notice of every body else." These discoveries, too, were made at a time when the promulgation of them "produced no small degree of heat and controversy at the weekly meetings"!! It is enlivening, however, to learn, that an assembly, possessing so powerful an influence on the public welfare, is at length restored to comparative harmony: "There *is* not now," thank heaven! "above two or three who adhere to their old opinions"; and we must hold ourselves deeply indebted to your correspondent, for the interesting intelligence, whatever be the precise object of his communications: whether it be to eulogize his own preternatural sagacity, or utterly to confound and demolish those two or three refractory spirits, who remain impervious to remonstrance,

"And who, though vanquished, yet will argue still."

At one time, indeed, it should seem, these disconsolate disputants were almost reduced to silence and despair. How unlucky then must we regard the arrival of those inflammatory "papers"! and how ought we to pursue with execration those artful writers who have given ardour to stupidity, and language to dumb-foundedness! —I fear, Mr. Editor, you will be more disposed to admire my temerity than my prudence, in presuming to take the field against a foe so formidable; in daring to frown defiance on one who enjoys the stated advantages of hebdomadal discussion, and who domineers over the politics of a neighbourhood. But, Sir, I must declare that, notwithstanding the laboured ingenuity of your correspondent, I do still think the "mode of reasoning," upon which he has lavished his animadversions, neither manifestly unfair, nor particularly complicated: and why he should choose to represent his refractory brethren, as incapable of arriving at it by their unaided efforts of excogitation, unless by way of contrasting his own perspicuity by their dulness, I really have not the pleasure to comprehend. How far the reasoning of the club may partake of the above mentioned qualities, remains to be examined.—The general propositions, laid down with such imposing formality, by your correspondent, I am fully disposed to admit. It is very certain that the evidence of testimony unsupported by correlative circumstances, is mainly regulated by the value of personal character; that the "bias of interest" will render it suspicious; and that the violation of truth will justify us in "setting it aside, as totally "unworthy of belief." Let us look a little at the application of these data.—Mrs. Clarke, for the benevolent purpose of paying her upholsterer's bill, thinks proper to prefer a charge against Colonel Wardle, the very existence of which, according to "a Lover of Truth," she had most unequivocally denied in the house of commons. Here we have both interest and contradiction. Now for the inference—That her accusation is false, her testimony worthless?—I thank you, says our acute logician; but that is not exactly the purpose for which my propositions were schemed. I brought them forward not to uphold the "*sinking* cause" of Col. Wardle, believe me, but to assist the Duke of York.—In the name of common sense, Mr. Editor, why should his royal highness be hooked up so triumphantly? In what respects can Mrs. Clarke's saying or unsaying her story of negociation prove or disprove a charge perfectly distinct? How can her "variance of testimony," in this instance, bear upon a case in which there is no variance. Her general credibility as a witness, indeed, it may and does affect: her unsubsantiated evidence it may and does impair; and if this be all your correspondent has fatigued his faculties to evince, I would beg leave to tell him, he has only undertaken to prove what every man in his wits was fully convinced of. But he must excuse me for adding, that, so long as he has stamped no contradiction on the proof of connivance; so long as he leaves it *in medio* whether that proof do rest on "unsupported testimony," he has gained nothing to his purpose. The former indeed, he has attempted, by convicting Mrs. Clarke of a practical falsehood in the very fact of accusing Col. Wardle! but the latter he has wittily tossed over to a "friend."—As for Mrs. Clarke, it is by no means my intention to perplex myself with *her* defence. I consign her to the malediction of "the club" without remorse. This

infuriated leader of a triumphant majority may pour upon her devoted head the whole storm of his accumulated vengeance. He is perfectly welcome. But can he be ignorant that, in so doing he is essentially befriending the "*sinking* cause," of Col. Wardle? Can it possibly escape his self-praised discernment, that upon this very hinge—the incredibility of her interested and contradictory testimony — Colonel Wardle's justification entirely turns? — Your correspondent, Sir, professes to be disconcerted with the "*unfairness*" of the "mode of reasoning," assumed by Mr. Cobbett and other writers, in favour of Colonel Wardle: apparently unsuspicious that the whole course of his own argumentation is diametrically opposite to that first taken, by their disinterested adversaries, on the occasion of the trial. Far from attempting to convict Mrs. Clarke of contradiction, *they* hailed her return to their broken and dispirited ranks with the most extravagant exultation. Far from calling into question, in this instance, the credibility of her depositions, they generously entertained every word of them; and were even willing to pardon her former deviations into propriety, in their first flush of gratitude for this new and almost unhoped-for display of perfidy. Now, in opposition to this ridiculous inconsistency, I do contend, it was perfectly *fair* to argue, that *if* Mrs. Clarke's testimony was so very immaculate when offered against Mr. Wardle, it was not absolutely incredible when produced against the Duke of York; that *if*, as a credible witness, she stigmatized Mr. Wardle with negotiation, his royal highness, by parity of reasoning, could not possibly be exonerated from connivance. But now steps forward a controversialist of a new description: who thinks proper to shift the ground of the argument; who skulks behind the artillery, and then, with a bravery truly admirable, derides its ineffectual fire. As a defender of corruption, we may pardon this ingenious writer for his adroitness: his conduct is equally fair with that of the generality of his friends:

——— male verum examinat *omnis*
Corruptus judex:

but as a "Lover of Truth" we must pronounce him guilty of most flagrant infidelity to his mistress.—But this new position; is it more tenable? This new course, is it more direct? In my humble opinion, not an inch:

Ille sinistrorsum, hic dextrorsum abit; unus utrique
Error, sed variis illudit partibus—

For who, I ask, but one habituated to the everlasting wranglings of a weekly vigil, would ever think of maintaining, that the point blank contradictions of this misguided woman, should confirm her credibility in one instance, and destroy it in another; and that too, when the proof of dishourable collusion in Col. Wardle, rests infinitely more on contradictory and unsubstantiated evidence, than the proof of connivance in the Duke of York. Your correspondent, Sir, calls her evidence in the former case "*consistent;*" and yet (mark the absurdity of error) is actually at the pains of shewing that in daring even to assert the charge, she stands clearly convicted of deliberate falsehood. —What! was the testimony delivered in court, *indeed* more "free from the strong bias of personal interest," was it *really* more clear and better supported than that produced in parliament? The witnesses to collateral facts were perhaps more *numerous?* This, I should think, would hardly be imposed on "the club." The parties then were less interested in the result? Possibly, though I confess I do not recollect that even *one* witness was interrogated, who had 1,900*l.* depending on the inquiry, or whose profits were augmented in proportion to the extravagance of a confederate. Or, lastly, were "truth," and "justice" out-faced by the specious purity of reputation? This, indeed, seems a point, not undesirable to your correspondent's argument. But, yet, Sir, as far as I can find, the leading witness was in both cases the same; and it is certain, her character sustained a much severer scrutiny in the house of commons, than in the court of King's Bench. If there were some of our representatives, who indulged their eloquence, in "expatiating on her fine feelings, and her beautiful evidence," there were others, who did not scruple to handle those *fine* feelings very roughly, and to twist that *beautiful* evidence, into every possibility of distortion. Indeed, Sir, I am greatly mistaken, if it will not puzzle more than the *combined* efforts of your two ingenious correspondents to prove, that Mrs. Clarke's depositions were received in evidence upon trust; or that, supposing her then to have divulged her pretensions to infamy and dishonour, much more *could* have been done in attempting to divest the current of public

attention from incontestible facts, to flimsy declamation.—With regard to col. Wardle's character, though a "*sinking*" one, I am happy to observe, that the remarks of your correspondent upon it, are much less defamatory, than upon that of the amiable perfidous. He has not launched against it the same bold and animated ratiocination: nor has he inhumanly attempted to impale it on the horns of a "*dilemma.*" Satisfied with announcing in the outset, the profound discoveries of himself and a few "others, who constituted a very small mi-"nority at the weekly meetings," he has prudently left the demonstration of them, to the sagacity of his readers: for, I do not find, in the sequel of his communication, even the abortion of an attempt, to bring to light those "lurking motives that "would not bear exposure," to chastise Mr. Wardle for the "indecent eagerness of his "accusations," or to enlarge upon the mean-"ness and vulgarity of his patriotism." —In fine, Mr. Editor, not to extend this discussion beyond all bounds, I would only beg leave to observe, that the intemperate hilarity assumed by the hirelings of ministry, and the advocates of corruption, on the occasion of this trial, is not more ridiculous, than it is impolitic. By their eagerness in catching hold of this twig of hope, they have only discovered the extent of their former despondence. They might have spared this manifestation of their weakness. The reputation of Col. Wardle is not a bubble that hangs on the breath of popular applause. His fame, however they may wish it, is not yet defunct; and I will venture to predict, that his "noble and disinterested defiance of "power," will be viewed with admiration, long after the premature dirges of these ditty-mongers have been despised and are forgotten.

Absint, *inani* funere, næniæ,
Luctusque turpes, et querimoniæ;
Compesce clamorem; ac sepulcri
Mitte *supervacuus* honores.

T. W. Sept. 11th. VARIUS.

OFFICIAL PAPERS.

EXPEDITION TO HOLLAND. — *(continued from p. 416.)*

I add a list of the enemy's ships now in sight. I received the same at Ter Goes, at eleven o'clock, where I spent the night. It is possible, before night, there may be some further movement. Yesterday some French pinnaces arrived at Fort Bathz, but afterwards proceeded again to Lillo. I know not whether the French army has made a movement. The communication with the Prince de Ponte Corvo is become more difficult, and this is certainly the reason why I have received no answer to my letter of the 4th.

The Marshal of Holland, DUMONCEAU.

At the Chapel at Ter Goes, 6th of Sept. 2 in the afternoon.

(Here follows a list of the vessels observed, amounting in all to 218.)

Report from Marshal Dumonceau, &c.

Sire; Fort Bathz was taken on the 4th, your Majesty's anniversary. This enterprise appears to have caused the greatest astonishment to the enemy. The same evening, I proceeded to Bergen-op-Zoom, where I arrived with all my troops at night. Adm. Ruijsch and gen. de Mellet, governor of the place, gave me all the assistance in their power, in order to collect the vessels necessary for the transport of the troops with which I was to repair to S. Beveland. We embarked on the 5th, about noon. On quitting the harbour, several of the vessels stranded; I followed with the remainder, and arrived at five in the evening before Wemeldingen. The enemy, who was at anchor at the distance of one and an half cannon shot, saw our movements, without making any attempt to interrupt them, and all my troops were disembarked without any accident. Our horses could not be disembarked till the morning of the 6th; and during the night, the enemy amused himself with sending some soldiers in sloops, who fired with musketry upon our vessels, which were protected by a battalion of the 3d regiment of the line. After the disembarkation, I sent three companies of chasseurs to take possession of the town of Ter Goes, and I went thither likewise with major-general Stedman, Chief of the general Staff. At seven o'clock we entered amid the ringing of bells, while the master of the horse, and lieut.-gen. Bruno, one of your Majesty's best generals, collected his troops around Wemeldingen. On the 6th, at day-break, the general proceeded with three battalions, to Ter Goes, while two battalions were placed behind the Sloe.—During the night, and at day-break, I was informed that the hostile force which environed me was still considerable. We saw 218 vessels as well frigates as brigs and cutters without counting boats, which from the mist, could not be count-

ed. The enemy's fleet in the East Scheldt was drawn up at Zierikzee before the Keeten, and above by Stavernisse, while 120 ships were moored in the West Scheldt, from Bonselen to Baarland. This being our situation, we were somewhat exposed; but when the enemy perceived that we were up the Sloe, and that our riflemen were arrived at Elleweutsdyk where he stood in great force, he thought himself more exposed than we were; for during the evening and night, he withdrew on the one side to Flushing, and on the other behind Zierikzee, and in the Roompot.—When our riflemen came to Elleweutsdyk, the enemy who occupied that village retreated, and our voltigeurs made a few prisoners. Serjeant Smit alone took four Englishmen prisoners, so much were they confounded.—Since yesterday morning the enemy had not approached South Beveland; he occupies Walcheren, and is raising six or seven batteries, each of four pieces, on the Sloe-bank, in order to defend the passage.—Leaving general Bruno the care of watching the enemy, I yesterday proceeded to Batz, taking with me captain of engineers Van Ingen, a distinguished young officer, whom I cannot too strongly recommend to your Majesty. —Intelligence which arrived yesterday evening, announces that the enemy is evacuating Ter-Vere. Your Majesty may be assured, that I shall take all possible care to obey faithfully the instructions your Majesty has been pleased to give me. I have, during the few hours since I have been here, prepared every thing for carrying on my operations. I am about instantly to depart from hence.

"Marshal DUMONCEAU."

Amsterdam, Sept. 7.—The following are the particulars contained in the Official Report concerning the passage of our army from Brabant to South Beveland:—On the 4th inst. general Heiligers, in consequence of intelligence gained by reconnoitring a few days before, placed himself at the head of a company of voltigeurs of the 1st regiment of chasseurs, and a company of carbiniers, and, during the ebb, availing himself of the distance at which the English ships were, waded with his party up to their shoulders in the water, over a passage of more than a league, and of which the path was very narrow, and full of holes, and in spite of the stream, and the holes in the bottom, these chasseurs succeeded in crossing, without losing a single man. What increases the merit of this enterprise is, the necessity under which they were of undertaking it precisely at 3 o'clock of the afternoon, when the ebb was at the lowest: at which time a gloomy tempest deprived the soldiers of the sight of the island and fort. The short duration of the ebb did not allow a greater number of men to wade over; and the army remained on the shore for a long time, uneasy concerning the detachment, as the continuance of the storm did not permit them to perceive whether the fort defended itself.—At length, at seven in the evening, the Dutch flag was seen waving on the fort. An express was then sent to Antwerp. The prince, general in chief of the French army, was informed of it at nine in the evening, and announced it at the Theatre of the city.—The chasseurs and carbiniers were received by the inhabitants of Bathz, with the most lively demonstrations of joy, amid the continued shouts of Long live the King! Gen. Heiligers praises the intrepidity and valour of captains Schuurmen and Tabor, as well as of the lieutenants of engineers Cornabe and Wolf de Westerholt. It was impossible for the little corps to make great haste, surrounded by dangers; and yet obliged to end their march in consequence of the flow of the tide; a moment's delay, or indecision, would have been fatal to them.—His Majesty, desirous to recognise the service rendered by these brave men, and the dangers to which they exposed themselves, without any hope of retreating, and without being terrified by the numbers of the foe; who, they knew, were on the opposite side of the river, has rewarded them, through general Heiligers, by expressing to him his satisfaction at their conduct. He has granted promotion to the before mentioned officers; and ordered, that, without distinction of rank, all those who were in the detachment of general Heiligers, should wear on the left side of the coat an embroidered sabre. The soldiers, and non-commissioned officers, shall, during the campaign, enjoy double pay.

LONDON:—Printed by T. C. HANSARD, Peterborough-Court, Fleet-Street;
Published by R. BAGSHAW, Brydges-Street, Covent-Garden:—Sold also by J. BUDD, Pall-Mall.